JOURNAL OF THOUGHT

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

CONTENTS

J. D. Salinger As A Teacher of Zen — *Albert W. Vogel*

Utilitarianism: A Common Issue For the Sciences and Humanities — *Henry R. Weinstock*

Imprinting: An Added Factor in the Heredity-Environment Problem — *Arthur J. TerKeurst*

Return of The North Sea Ghosts — *Leslie Anders*

Volume 1, Number 1 JANUARY, 1966

Journal Of Thought

An Interdisciplinary Journal

Published Quarterly at Warrensburg, Missouri

Board of Editors

JAMES J. VAN PATTEN, editor-in-chief, Education and Philosophy
ARTHUR J. TERKEURST, Psychology
KATHERINE MORONEY, English
KATHLEEN RANSON, Education
ERWINA GODFREY, Social Science
CARLTON BOWYER, History and Philosophy
LLOYD WILLIAMS, Social Foundations
FRANKLIN PARKER, History and Education

The **Journal of Thought** is published quarterly in Warrensburg, Missouri. Any relation of the title or format of this Journal to any other is purely coincidental. The opinions and views expressed in the contents of this journal are those of the respective individual authors and not necessarily those of the editors.

The **Journal of Thought** seeks to provide an area of communication for scholars in the varied academic disciplines in higher education. The Journal seeks to increase the knowledge among and between the various academic disciplines, and is not intended to be competitive with any existing Journal.

The Editors welcome all material submitted providing such material is scholarly competent and well written. Short manuscripts with as little footnoting as possible are most desirable. The next issue (April) will be devoted to a critical analysis of 20th century values emphasizing analysis of social protests.

Articles should be submitted legibly typed (one original and one carbon) and accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope for return.

Articles to be considered for publication should be submitted to JAMES VAN PATTEN, JOURNAL OF THOUGHT, Central Missouri State College.

Rates are $1.00 per copy. Make checks or money orders payable to James Van Patten, Journal of Thought Fund, Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Missouri.

JANUARY VOLUME 1 NUMBER 1 1966

A Note About Our Editors

James J. Van Patten received his B.A. from Syracuse University and the Ph.D. from the University of Texas. He is Associate Professor of Education and Philosophy at Central Missouri State College. A number of articles dealing with critical analysis of philosophers and educational assumptions have been written by Professor Van Patten.

Arthur J. TerKeurst is mentioned in "A Note About Our Contributors."

Kathleen Ranson is Professor of Education at Central Missouri State College. She received her B.S. from Longwood College, M.A. from George Peabody College and her Ed. D degree from the University of Missouri. She has served on a number of education and research committees and is now Research Chairman for Delta Kappa Gamma of the Missouri Association for Childhood Education. She served on the Committee for the Missouri Guide for Language Arts for Junior and Senior High Schools and is now on the Missouri Mental Health Committee on "Resources For Children and Youth."

Katherine Moroney is Associate Professor of English at Central Missouri State College. She received her B.A. and M.A. from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma and the Ph.D. from Oklahoma University. She was a teaching fellow at Oklahoma University before coming to Central Missouri. Her principal areas of study are Shakespeare, Renaissance and American Literature.

Erwina E. Godfrey is Associate Professor of Social Science at Central Missouri State College. She received the A.B. degree at Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky and the M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Kentucky. She teaches political theory and Latin American history and culture. Professor Godfrey has taught at the American School in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. She has authored a number of articles for the **Journal of Inter-American Studies** and the **Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.**

Carlton Bowyer, of the Department of History and Philosophy of Education, University of Texas, received his A.B. in English, M.A. in Philosophy and Ph.D. in History and Philosophy of Education from the University of Missouri. Professor Bowyer has written a number of articles for professional journals in addition to a book **Directory of Education Associations** in 1962. Professor Bowyer has co-authored two books with William E. Drake of the University of Texas, both of which deal with Philosophy of Education. Professor Bowyer has taught at Stephens College, University of Missouri, Kansas State Teachers College at Emporia and the University of Alabama.

Franklin Parker is Professor of Education at the University of Oklahoma at Norman whose writings on educational policy trends in the U.S. and abroad appear widely in print. A biographer and bibliographer of note, he regularly writes "Recent Events in World Education" for the **Comparative Education Review,** and is listed in **Social Scientists Specializing in African Studies** (Unesco, 1964) and **National Register of Educational Researchers** (Phi Delta Kappa, 1965).

Lloyd Williams is Professor of Educational Philosophy at the University of Oklahoma. He received his bachelor's and master's degrees at North Texas State College and his Ph.D. at the University of Texas. He has taught at Ohio State University, University of Texas, and served as Dean of Liberal Arts at Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio. He has written a number of articles and book reviews. **Phi Delta Kappan** recently published an article by Professor Williams, "The Struggle for Balance—Vocational Education in the Western World."

A Note About Our Contributors

Albert W. Vogel is Assistant Professor of Education at the University of New Mexico. He has written extensively for professional journals and has published articles on Wolfe, C. P. Snow, Richard Wright, Herman Hesse and Lawrence Durrell. Dr. Vogel has two degrees in English which accounts for his making a scholarly specialty out of the theme of education in works of British and American fiction.

Henry Robert Weinstock, the author of "Utilitarianism: A Common Issue for the Sciences and Humanities," is presently Assistant Professor of Education at Kansas State University in the areas of science education and philosophy of education. His undergraduate background is physics, his Master's and doctorate being in science and philosophy of education. He received the Ed. D degree from the University of Georgia in 1965. He taught physics in both high school and college before continuing with his graduate work in education. He is a member of the Philosophy of Education Society, the American Association of Physics Teachers, Phi Delta Kappa, and Phi Kappa Phi. His major area of interest at the present time is research in the structuring and application of educational theory.

Dr. Arthur J. Ter Keurst is Professor of Psychology at Central Missouri State College. He was graduated from Northwestern University with a Ph.D. degree in educational psychology. He is a fellow in the American Psychological Association, in the American Association for the Advancement of Science and in the Missouri Psychological Association. One of his extracurricular activities is translating articles from Dutch psychology magazines and abstracting them for **Psychological Abstracts.**

Leslie Anders, Professor of History at Central Missouri State College formerly held the position of historian in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army. He was graduated from the College of Emporia and holds the A. M. and Ph. D. degrees from the University of Missouri. Born in Admire, Kansas, he has been a member of the history staff at Central Missouri State since 1955. (He is the author of (**The Ledo Road**), published by the Oklahoma Unviersity Press in 1965.

Journal Of Thought

Volume 1 No. 1 January 1966

CONTENTS

A Fable for Philosophers — Robert C. Jones ..... Page 6

J. D. Salinger As A Teacher of Zen — Albert W. Vogel — Page 7

Utilitarianism: A Common Issue For the Sciences and Humanities — Henry R. Weinstock ..... Page 15

Imprinting: An Added Factor in the Heredity-Environment Problem — Arthur J. Ter Keurst ..... Page 19

Return of The North Sea Ghosts — Leslie Anders ..... Page 23

Private Foundations — Franklin Parker ..... Page 30

editorial —

With a population explosion on college and university campuses, it is increasingly imperative that educators continually define and redefine the dimension of their Lebenswelt or life world. It is becoming easier for professors to become almost totally isolated from the concept of an academic team and to concentrate on their area of specialization exclusively. With a series of isolated departments and colleges, students frequently engage in four years or more of learning activity without an awareness of the activities carried on outside their area of concentration. It would seem quite appropriate, therefore, to provide an arena of communication among the various academic disciplines whereby professors may engage in discussion with members of other disciplines. Further, such an arena would aid professors in keeping up with the knowledge explosion by giving them some insights in the work being done by the other disciplines. The Journal of Thought seeks to provide an interdisciplinary periodical devoted to enlarging the horizons of educators so that they may in turn aid students in understanding work being done in the totality of the academic community, and more clearly delineate the student role in this community.

James J. Van Patten

Central Missouri State

A Fable for Philosophers

Boethius and Augustine,
As nourishing as Ovaltine:
A chocolate flavor in a cup,
You pour them out and mix them up.
Feeling droopy? Moorings drifted?
Gus will get your faith uplifted.
Some like thinking, some like drinking.
Deep within the wine cup sinking.
If the truth from out the bottle
Flusters you, try Aristotle.
He's the lad who's got the answers:
How to part the dance from dancers,
And with method Greek empirical
Paint a view of life that's lyrical.
Plato was a sophist buff
Who taught about the caves and stuff.
Diogenes, the flashlight man,
And Zeno's turtle also ran.
Tis poor philosophy to split
The world to atoms, bit by bit.
Democritus could never tell
The truths that he drowned in a well;
But, for that matter T. Aquinas
Dried them all out in doctrinas.
If **cogito, ergo sum**
Makes you choke and leave the room,
Try a little inference:
See God sitting on the fence,
Pushing out a languid thumb
To spin us all to Kingdom Come.
Or perchance the modern view
Might be the one that pleases you.
Nietzsche, Hegel, Spencer, Kant,
Spinoza, James, or, if you want,
We might drum up a name or two
Like Jean-Paul Sartre, or A. Camus:
As existential as you please,
With pleasant little mysteries
Like asking someone (God knows who.
Don't be so petty—**sacre bleu!**):
"If I should jump in this abyss,
Would you catch me or would you miss?"
Ah, welladay, when all is said
And done, there's just the quick and dead.
Tis when you're quick there's no need to drink
The **mene tekel** on the wall
Erase by grape, or worm and gall,
And while you thirst drink to the lees,
For soon all thirsting has to cease
And down in lovely muck you'll lie
While life above goes hurrying by.
And **there'll** be time to meditate
Upon the joke that men call fate;
And **there** the bitter truth be found:
Not in the cup, but underground.

—**Robert C. Jones**

J. D. Salinger As a Teacher of Zen

by Albert W. Vogel
Assistant Professor of Social Foundations
University of New Mexico

The history of Zen in the United States is ambigious and complicated. Zen has been known if not understood by American travelers to Japan since Perry opened that country in 1853. John Dewey visited Japan and was impressed by a Zen Judo class in 1919. Scholars in Europe and the United States studied Zen throughout the nineteen-twenties and -thirties without necessarily contributing to its influence. Dr. D. T. Susuki published his **Essays in Zen Buddhism,** First Series (London, Luzac and Co.) in 1927. And Zen touched the art world both before and after World War Two. Since World War Two, Zen has found its way into psychoanalytic and educational theory. In the popular mind, Zen is most closely identified with the "beatnik" poets and writers; although, it is common for serious scholars of Zen to point out that the beatniks really do not understand Zen—a criticism that is both true and false. Obviously, for some of the beatniks Zen is little more than a self-deceptive affectation. But it is also an affectation for one to criticize another's commitment to Zen only because that person lacks scholarship or instruction. Zen is undoubtedly the most sophisticated form of Buddhism, but it is also the least intellectual form of Buddhism and the least dependent upon ritual, doctrine, or the educational process. The confusion results from an overdependence upon Western educational techniques which see education as a process rather than as an end: "This seminar will meet three times a week for sixteen weeks. There will be a final. Those with B or better will have achieved Satori, those with grades below B will have achieved Little Satori. We will cover the following subjects." As we shall see, Zen provides but does not require an educational technique. And it is reasonable to suppose that one's secretary could spontaneously achieve Enlightenment as easily as oneself. This principle holds true in Salinger's fiction as well, in a very special way. Salinger writes about Americans in the American environment although the philosophy which informs the work is Zen. Salinger's problem is to find a way of preserving the realism of the American environment at the same time that he preserves the integrity of the Zen philosophy. This problem can only be solved by finding elements of American culture which correspond to the steps in the Zen educational pattern. How well, and to what end, Salinger does this, we shall examine in this essay. But before turning our attention to Salinger, it will be necessary to say a word or two about Zen teaching so that we shall have something against which to make our examination.

The aim of Zen is Satori, or Enlightenment, as it is known in the West. There are many roads to Satori, some long, some quite short; there is also Little Satori, which is the temporary achievement of Satori followed by a return to the unEnlightened state. Through the use of certain teaching techniques the Master may help the pupil reach Satori, but he cannot teach the pupil in the Western sense of the word, and he cannot test or examine his pupil to see how much the pupil has learned. The pupil knows when he has reached Satori, but he cannot describe it. He may present his sense of Satori in some mystical or artistic way, but the presentation partakes of the nature of Satori, and so probably cannot be understood by one who has not himself achieved Satori.

From the view-point of Western psychology, Satori is a matter of transcending the intellect. To the Zen Buddhist, the intellect is a cage wherein one's thoughts are imprisoned. Intellectual training of the mind in the rational, logical way of Western education merely makes the prison stronger, whereas Zen teaching attempts to break through the bars of the cage with light, and to know directly rather than know **about.**

While Zen employs a Master and a pupil, and the Master employs certain educational techniques, neither the Master nor his techniques are necessary for the achievement of Satori. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the spontaneous achievement of Satori without help is an exception rather than a rule. Most pupils engage a Master, and most Masters use the teaching techniques to some extent, just as we shall see done in the work of Salinger.

The first of these techniques is the **Koan.** The **Koan** is a word or phrase which has no meaning for the rational mind. If the pupil asks, "Master, can I learn from you?" the Master might answer: "The red and the blue rose are one."

The second technique, the **Zagen,** involves the body as well as the mind. In its most superficial form **Zagen** is little more than a series of exercises (sitting, breathing, painting, playing music) which help the pupil transcend the processes of intellect and action by which one is usually educated. But as with all other matters of Zen doctrine, the exercises are not required to be performed in any special way.

The **Mondo** is a form of rapid question and answer session between Master and pupil, and its purpose is to propel the pupil beyond his intellect. As the process quickens, the questions and answers intensify, becoming in the end, problems which cannot be solved through logic **(Koan).** To some, it appears as if the Master is bringing the pupil to the brink of a nervous breakdown, which in the Western sense he may be doing, but because of important basic commitments in the psychological set of the pupil, it is rather unlikely that the pupil will slip over the brink*. Zen, as do most spiritual and philosophical conversions, begins with crisis and criticism. One feels that one's present committment is inadequate in some way, and so begins looking around for something with which to replace it.

* For an additional discussion of the psychoanalytic aspects of Zen, cf. Eric Fromm, **et al., Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis** (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960).

Under ordinary conditions, the Zen Master will have achieved Satori, but because in this as in all doctrinal matters nothing is rigidly prescribed, it is possible for one pupil to help another, or for a Master who has not achieved his highest level of Satori to help a pupil to go beyond the point he has achieved himself.*2

Westerners sometimes think of Satori as a kind of hypnotic state where the pupil is entirely detached from reality. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Underlying all Buddhism is the doctrine of the Middle Way, which does not mean compromise, as the English words suggest, but ". . . wherein the pendulum of the opposites has come to rest, where both sides of the coin are equally valued and immediately seen."*3 The Middle Way might be further illustrated in this way. A man trembles in fear of death. To overcome his fear, he goes to the opposite extreme and blots the fear from his mind, but the void is as frustrating and unhealthy as the fear was. When he learns to accept the fact that he will always know some fear, he has achieved the Middle Way. It is necessary to grasp this concept if one is to understand Salinger's SEYMOUR, AN INTRODUCTION. It is the Middle Way that makes it possible for one who has achieved Satori to work and live in society, even making it possible for an Enlightened one to work with his intellect, without endangering his Enlightenment.*4

As is often the case when one begins searching for a new set of spiritual and philosophical values, Salinger starts from a position of criticism. This criticism centers on Western society and Western education, and it is illustrated in most cases through the failings of characters in the stories and novels. And it will serve our purpose to examine some of the criticism here. The examples which follow are typical, and by no means exhaust the evidence.

The important thing about many of the characters in Salinger's fiction is that they have been let down by the cultural and educational apparatus of Western society. In "Uncle Wiggily in Connecticut"*5 we are introduced to Eloise and Mary Jane, two frustrated and unhappy women. They have been to an American college, and have even studied psychology, but in spite of their education and the psychology they have studied, they are no closer to solving the unhappy riddle of their lives than if they had never attended college at all. All they seem able to remember about college are a few meaningless incidents: Louise Hermanson in a black brassiere, a borrowed cardigan, an unpleasant remark about a dress, and a professor's death. It might be that to one who has achieved Satori, these desperate incidents would hold some meaning, but for these young women all of life is meaningless and unrelated.

*2For additional discussion cf. D. T. Suzaki, ESSAYS IN ZEN BUDDHISM, First Series (London: Luzac and Co., 1927) pp. 216ff. And Alan Watts, THE WAY OF ZEN (New York: The New American Library, 1957) pp. 158ff.

*3Christmas Humphries, BUDDHISM (England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1951) p. 185.

*4Cf. A, J, Bahm, PHILOSOPHY OF THE BUDDHA (New York: Collier Books, 1962) pp. 66-75.

*5The stories cited are collected in NINE STORIES (1948). The novel, THE CATCHER IN THE RYE was published in 1946. FRANNY AND ZOOEY (1955) and RAISE HIGH THE ROOF BEAM, CARPENTERS and SEYMOUR, AN INTRODUCTION (1963) are long stories. All editions are published under the imprint of Little, Brown and Co., Boston. All quotations are from these editions.

In "Just Before the War with the Eskimos," we again meet people who have quit college because it held no meaning for them, and who wander around looking for some purpose with which to bolster their lives. In "The Laughing Man," Wellesley is referred to as "a very high-class school," although no mention is made of the wisdom that might be found there. Clearly, Wellesley has social value, but no spiritual or philosophical value. "For Esme—with Love and Squalor" describes a psychology professor who analyzes the behavior of two combat soldiers on the basis of a letter the least intelligent and least sensitive of them writes to his girl friend. Ironically, a quotation one of the soldiers finds written in a book ("Fathers and Teachers, I ponder, what is hell") points out that one has a right to turn to one's teachers as well as to one's fathers for help in answering life's profoundest problems. But no one would consider turning to the psychology professor described in the story, any more than one could consider turning to Madame Bovary of "Columbia Extension School," ("Pretty Mouth and Green My Hair"), who offers a course in "Television Appreciation." The use of the word EXTENSION points to the basic problem here. Both teachers are at too many removes from life to be of any use discussing life's meaning, to say nothing of the meaning of Hell.

Mr. Yoshoto ("De Daumier-Smith's Blue Period") runs a correspondence art school which makes a point of excluding wisdom from its instruction. When an instructor, De Daumier-Smith, tries to get close to one of his students, a Nun, the student is withdrawn by her Mother Superior. She is withdrawn not because the Mother Superior fears some sort of sexual involvement, but because she is not interested in an education which is based on human values and which aims at something beyond the intellect. She wants exactly the kind of education Mr. Yoshoto's school promised: precise, rational, mechanical, and intellectual. Mr. Yoshoto is Japanese, but like many who abandon one culture for another, he has become more Western in his thinking than many Westerners. When the school is closed by the authorities, it is because it does not have a license, not because it does not "teach."

"Teddy" contains a great deal that is of interest to an educational theorist. Teddy is a gifted boy who has developed on his own the ability to see beyond the illusory differences of things. He is studied by scientists educated in the Western tradition who feel that they can measure or analyze these abilities in a quantitative way. Their approach is wrong and they fail. Teddy is not a genius in the Western rationalist sense of the word. He is simply one who has achieved a measure of Satori, and this the scientists cannot and will not understand.

This discussion of the failure of Western Intellectualism is carried forward in THE CATCHER IN THE RYE. One cannot escape the conclusion that Holden Caulfield is a sensitive and intelligent boy. Like Teddy, he would like to find the path to wisdom and he would like to be able to see beyond the illusory differences between things in the material world. His education has failed him because it does not help him to do this, but rather prepares him for a life of compromise and material satisfaction: "Life is a game, boy. Life is a game that one plays according to the rules," his teacher tells him. A theme that is repeated elsewhere by another of his teachers, Mr. Antolini, who tells him a great deal of nonsense about finding the size of his mind, and applying himself in an academic way, and much more, without ever touching on the main issue in education, the attainment of wisdom. Neither teacher is willing to address himself to the basic questions of life's

purposes and meanings, and so they are useless as far as Holden is concerned.

In FRANNY AND ZOOEY one finds Franny's boy friend, Lane, babbling about Flaubert in an academic and abstracted way, without ever coming close to the meanings underlying Flaubert's world. Like many men in the academic world, he is interested in using Flaubert as a tool for building a teaching career, and he is not interested in the basic, philosophical issues which drive authors to literature. Elsewhere in the story Franny and Lane speak of two institutional house poets, Manlius and Esposito, who publish in the little magazines, teach "precious" courses, get tenure, but never ask themselves the questions great poets ask, nor seek Enlightenment, nor create anything beautiful. In ZOOEY there is the suggestion that Zooey get his Ph.D. so that he will have something to "fall back on," should he fail as an actor. The word **philosophy** has lost all meaning in the title, and the degree has become little more than a union card. Zooey's "beautiful Greek will (be) no good at all on any good-sized campus unless (he) has a Ph.D.," his brother, Buddy, writes him.

SEYMOUR, AN INTRODUCTION has turned out to be a problem for many American readers, because Seymour achieved Enlightenment before he killed himself, and American readers consider this a contradiction. But the contradiction is only an apparent one based upon a failure to understand the symbolic structure of the work. Seymour killed himself not because self destruction is the aim of Zen teaching, but because it is the clearest way of showing that Seymour has transcended the illusory differences between things, especially the illusory differences between life and death.

Another problem for American readers is the fact that Seymour has achieved Satori, yet is able to make a living as a teacher in an American college, teaching, one suspects, the intellectual subjects of the Western curriculum without endangering his Enlightenment. The contradiction here disappears when one considers the doctrine of the Middle Way. Seymour has two extremes to examine before he has to make a choice. He could live in the material world entirely, as most of his colleagues do, or he could go to the other extreme and live entirely in the spiritual world, in which case he would probably be crushed by the pressures of American society. Or he could choose the Middle Way, in which he would acknowledge that he must live in the real world, a world that he cannot change, in order to survive. Once he has accepted this fact, he has eliminated the frustration and desire that would have been his had he chosen to go to either of the extremes.

Salinger's best examples of Zen teaching occur in the longish story ZOOEY, although they are prepared for in FRANNY, and there are intimations of Zen teaching in "Teddy."

Teddy, the prodigal child, attempts to teach Nicholson, a professor of education.

> "Would you hold up your arm a second please?" he (Teddy asked.
>
> Nicholson raised his forearm an inch or two above the level of the armrest. "This one?" he asked.
>
> Teddy nodded. "What do you call that?" he asked.
>
> "What do you mean? It's my arm. It's my arm."
>
> "How do you know it is?" Teddy asked. "You know it's

called an arm, but how do you know it is one? Do you have any proof that it's an arm?"

"It's an arm, for heaven's sake, because it's an arm. In the first place, it has to have a name to distinguish it from other objects. I mean you can't simply—"

"You're just being logical . . .," (Teddy said).

"Logical. You're just giving me a regular, intelligent answer," Teddy said. "I was trying to help you. You asked me how I got out of the private dimensions when I feel like it. I certainly don't use logic when I do it. Logic's the first thing you have to get rid of."

Elsewhere Teddy equates logic and the apple Adam ate in the garden of Eden, and when asked to describe his teaching method, he replies:

"I'm pretty sure I wouldn't start with the things schools usually start with. . . . . I think I'd first just assemble all the children together, and show them how to meditate. I'd try to show them how to find out why they are, not just what their names are and things like that. . . . I guess, even before that, I'd get them to empty out everything their parents and everybody ever told them. . . . Colors are only names. I mean if you tell them grass is green, it makes them start expecting grass to look a certain way."

Here, Teddy is employing both the **Koan** and the **Zagen** in his efforts to teach the teacher. He fails, of course, because the teacher is by no means ready to be taught. Nicholson is perfectly happy in his seminar and tweed existence.

The two stories, FRANNY AND ZOOEY approach the problem of Zen teaching more directly. Franny is by no means happy with her life and she is on the verge of a spiritual and emotional crisis. Her boyfriend, Lane, is a superficial, academic ass, and her college classes are abstracted and to use Salinger's word, "phoney." In an effort to escape, Franny has turned to a book which she found in her brother's library, THE WAY OF THE PILGRIM. One gathers that this book presents a way of escaping the pains of the material world. The book contains the Jesus Prayer, which Franny repeats over and over to herself in an effort to blot out the things that have been troubling her. This blotting out, of course, is the opposite extreme from Lane's superficial acceptance of the material world. The prayer doesn't work because at best it is nothing more than a form of self-hypnoticism. Siddhartha, in Hermann Hesse's novel of the same name (New Directions, 1951), faces a similar problem when he tries to achieve wisdom by studying under a Master who teaches him ritual sayings which he must repeat to himself. The suppression of the desires by this method fails for Siddhartha just as it fails for Franny.

At the insistence of their mother, Zooey "talks" to his sister. The conversation begins with a discussion of a dream that Franny has been having, and as it develops, it touches on numerous other desperate subjects: Carole Lombard, Hollywood, Professor Tupper, Chaung-Tzu, Restoration comedy, and more. This quick fire kind of discussion is the Western equivalent of the **Mondo**, or rapid question and answer period, which serves the same purpose here as the **Mondo** serves for

the Zen Master. It breaks down the logical structures built up in Franny's mind, and propels her to a level where she can begin thinking beyond logic. Zooey does two other things for Franny during the course of this discussion. He undercuts her confidence in the Jesus Prayer, thus freeing her from the strictures of ritual, and he ends her war on academic artificiality, thus leading her toward the Middle Way. She cannot change the academic world, and she cannot find contentment until she accepts the fact that she cannot change it and that it will always be somewhat artificial.

The discussion between them gathers in intensity until it pushes Franny to the edge of a mental crisis. She does not go over because she has established in her mind that a nervous breakdown would be "tenth-rate," and because she has accepted the fact that she must go through this educative process with Zooey regardless of the emotional strain.

Franny is lying on a sofa as they talk and she turns and assumes various positions from time to time, suggesting the **Zagen,** or the exercises which help one to break out of the intellectual cage. Whether the exercises follow any ritualistic pattern or not is unimportant to the student of Zen. The important thing about them is that they must help to break down the logical structures that Western education has built up in Franny's mind. One might note parenthetically that the seating arrangements usually employed in Western schools suggest logic and a rational outlook, whether the seats are arranged in rows or circles.

The Zen Master has several devices which he can use to break the last ties with logic in his student. Zooey chooses one which is unique and extremely suitable for the Western world: the telephone. He pretends that he is his brother Buddy, and he talks to Franny over the telephone from the other room in such a way as to suggest a voice coming in from a dimension beyond logic, or from a different "element" as Zooey calls it. The effect of this upon Franny is very similar to the effect of the **Koan** upon an Oriental student of Zen, destroying the logical structures built up in Franny's mind and setting her free from her cage. To complete the job, Zooey drives in with the notion of the Fat Lady. It is typical of American readers that they try to find a symbolic representation for the Fat Lady; they try too hard. The Fat Lady represents nothing, therefore she represents everything. She is an irrational image which at once cuts the last tie with logic and the material world, and brings Franny to Satori where all things are one and where the illusory differences between material things disappear.

One can only speculate here as to whether Franny's Enlightenment is permanent. It would seem that Zooey has not reached permanent Satori himself, at least not in the way that Seymour had, and perhaps this is the reason he needed the help of the telephone and the "presence" of his brother, Buddy. It is possible that either or both of them might return to the unEnlightened state, but it should be remembered that Little Satori is not backsliding but merely a step in the process. The aim of Zen is Satori, and the length of time consumed, or the methods of instruction used to achieve it, are not important or relevant.

The major problem one has when one goes outside of one's own culture for an educational philosophy is that the philosophy finally adopted all too often strikes many people as being exotic, or Oriental in the case of Zen. And a philosophy that is exotic or Oriental is not likely to find much support, especially from the American public. If

Zen is ever to have a genuine impact upon American educational practice, someone is going to have to find a way of translating the exotic or Oriental elements into terms compatible with American culture; a complex and difficult job, if it is to be done properly. But the solution of that problem is beyond the limits of this essay. What we have tried to do here is to examine the steps taken by J. D. Salinger in that direction.

Salinger has by no means enunciated a comprehensive philosophy of Zen education for American culture. There are still too many questions which remain to be answered (questions of curriculum, patterns of administration, to mention only two), but he has shown that it might be possible to translate Zen educational practices so that they will be useful in American culture, and he has shown that Zen can do something to cure the malaise which he feels infects our society.

Utilitarianism: A Common Issue for the Sciences and Humanities

by HENRY R. WEINSTOCK
Assistant Professor of Education
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

The typical American college before the Civil War was a classical arts college offering a prescribed four-year curriculum in classical studies. The claims of modern language, modern humanities, the natural sciences, the social sciences, the fine arts, and professional studies other than the older professions of law, medicine, and theology were realized only slowly. The rather complex college of many departments and the multi-faculty university were largely post-Civil War, even twentieth-century developments. The elective system, the major-minor system, coeducation, and the federal land grant acts for agricultural and mechanical colleges, among other developments, radically altered the pattern of collegiate education in America.

Specialization of study, professionalism, even vocationalism, and a corresponding proliferation of courses, departments, majors, and schools brought new and more complex problems to American institutions of higher education. Such problems as liberal versus special and professional study, elective versus required courses, and numerous other problems appeared. Claims and counter claims were made for the values of particular courses, subjects or fields of study. A variety of vested interest groups pressed for courses, departments, or schools devoted to their particular ends. As more demands were placed upon colleges and universities, they found it increasingly difficult to meet these demands by balanced and reasonable programs.

Many of the fundamental issues and problems facing colleges in the era between the Civil War and World War II have become even more complex and pressing in the post-World War II and post-Sputnik eras. Classics, humanities, theology, and some of the more prestigious professions such as law have probably lost some of their public and academic prestige in the face of advancing scientific achievements. The public support and acclaim given to science raises an old issue in a new setting. What knowledge is of most worth? What constitutes a liberal education? How are liberal and professional or special studies to be properly balanced in a college education?

The Sciences and Humanities in the Curriculum

The rise of science, technology, new disciplines, and professional studies have made rather drastic inroads into the traditional humanistic curriculum of the liberal arts college. Yet few educators would deny that humanistic studies are part and parcel of general culture and liberal education. Few would seriously believe that humanistic studies are of little or no value in the preparation of scientists, technicians, or

professional workers. The major question may well be that concerning how much humanistic study, and humanistic studies of what sort.

Scientists, science educators, humanistic scholars, and humanistic educators have devoted attention to various facets of this issue. The problem is complicated, however, by the fact that neither the sciences nor the humanities are precise or unitary fields of study. Both are loosely formed departments of study that include diverse sub-fields. Both of the "broad fields" include not only specific disciplines, but also attitudes, conceptions, and philosophies of the sub-fields and of the broader areas of knowledge and study. For example, humanities may include languages, fine arts, philosophy and history, but they also include attitudes toward these disciplines, various conceptions about them, and a variety of philosophies about them which are often loosely termed "humanism" and "aesthetics."

Similarly, the sciences could be characterized in much the same way except that most general concerns would culminate in what is often termed "philosophy of science," "mathematical logic," or even "unity of science."

Scientists and advocates of the humanities, regardless of their sub-fields of specialization, their conception of a particular discipline, or their more general philosophical orientation, have shown considerable interest in general education. A rather extensive and recent (1963) review of such opinions indicates that two major points of view are held. These are concerned with the educational emphasis of college curricula, one asserting that humanistic interests be primary with the other maintaining that both the humanities and sciences be stressed. However, few views are to be found which seem to stress any notion about a pure science curriculum, one largely devoid of humanistic elements.

Humanistic Interests Are Primary

Among the advocates for a strongly humanistic curriculum, several sub-categories of views appear to be held. The first of these views represents those who strongly favor an idealized humanism and who indicate extreme disparagement over the influence of scientists and science on the course of thought. This group feels that the scientist is viewed wrongly as a miracle worker whom society has endowed with deep trust.

Another group of critics appears disparging of something even more basic than the emphasis of science. This is the shift in thinking regarding the humanities themselves, a tendency for them to become too organized, categorized, and objective. This group envisions a perilous future for the humanities in that (1) humanities are now in pursuit of status through specialism as in technology, thus preventing development of men of culture, and (2) that humanists have turned from interplay of mind with mind to objectivism and specialization, thus admitting defeat.

A third group of advocates of the humanistic curriculum feels that these speculative dangers to the humanities are exaggerated. Rather, the basic nature of philosophy, increasing respect for the humanities in professional schools, and a world uncertainty about values all tend to support the future humanistic aspects of the college curriculum.

Science and Humanities Together

Among the proponents of the second major point of view, that both the humanities and sciences should be stressed, there also appear to be sub-categories of reasoning. One such group emphasizes recognition of a deep interrelationship of science and humanities. This is exempli-

fied by the method of science promoting free inquiry, thus illustrating a strong humanistic tendency within the foundations of science itself.

Another view purports that better communication between the two fields is imperative in that (1) the products of scientific research are being controlled and used much more by non-scientists, (2) it is through the arts that sciences must be interpreted by the layman, and (3) despite increasing complexity and variety in languages, science is useful for explaining certain phenomena. The fact that language functions in many ways and serves many objectives is true in both the sciences and the humanities.

A third point of view is expressed by those who are concerned with the failure of many people to discriminate between science and technology. These critics feel that in the scientifically oriented world, this distinction has become more and more submerged. Thus the reduction of the sciences to the level of the practical or utilitarian tends to make the humanities impractical because of their contrasting apparent lack of productivity.

For A Common Defense

The question of whether a strong humanistic influence or a combined humanistic-science emphasis should prevail in the college curriculum is a moot question. As far as society is concerned, however, a common attribute of both humanistic and science education appears to be their practical outcomes. These outcomes reflect such values as economic reward, social stature, and intellectual prestige. These factors and others can clearly be interpreted as being influential in the decision of what courses of study students elect.

In the light of such utilitarian prospects, exponents of either the humanistic or science-humanistic curriculum face an uncertain future. Consequently, both factions in the issue may find it expedient to examine the similarities of the humanities and the sciences in an effort to prevent an extreme form of utilitarianism from overtaking them both. Fortunately, considerable evidence of common characteristics seems to make this task somewhat less difficult than it may seem at first. Both the sciences and humanities are often thought to use the same generalized conceptual tools: analysis, synthesis, and reduction to practice in their work, though the specific techniques and methods may differ.

It appears possible, then, that practitioners in the sciences and humanities may meet at the philosophical level of discourse. Here both may be capable of explicating and explaining numerous facets of human problems. This, in turn, may substantially promote more precise, more systematic, and more original thinking, and thereby afford a better basis for rational and ethical actions.

Finally, reasonable criteria for meaning, verification, explanation, and rational action do not seem to be limited to the "exact sciences," but may also be extended to the social sciences and humanities. Thus it may be within the common characteristics, methods, and goals of the humanities and sciences that answers are to be found to questions such as (1) which types of knowledge have the most worth? (2) what constitutes a liberal education? and (3) what is a desirable balance of liberal and professional studies?

RUTGERS — THE STATE UNIVERSITY

THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ANNOUNCES

Graduate Study and Research in Philosophy, History, and Sociology of Education

THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS offers programs of study leading to the master's and doctor's degrees in the areas of educational theory, philosophy, history, and sociology of education.

ASSISTANTSHIPS of $2,494 plus remission of tuition are available to doctoral candidates in the field of Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education. Holders of these awards will pay certain nominal fees including a student fee of $28.50 payable each term.

LOANS AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES are available to qualified graduate students.

INQUIRIES concerning ASSISTANTSHIPS should be addressed to the Chairman of the Department of Social and Philosophical Foundations, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers-The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Applications must be completed by March 1, 1966. Rutgers is an equal opportunity employer.
1966-1967

Imprinting: An Added Factor In the Heredity-Environment Program

By Arthur J. TerKeurst
Professor of Psychology
Central Missouri State College

The problem of the relationship between the inherited structure of a person and his behavior has baffled mankind for years. Although science has cleared up a considerable part of the heredity side of the problem by study of chromosome patterns, the factor of learning in this problem is still not clearly understood. At one time the learning process was subsumed under the rubric of classical and instrumental conditioning. More recently considerable evidence is produced that this learning of behavioral patterns is not entirely explainable by simple conditioning. This is the problem for this short paper.

Shortly after the coming of Darwin, Spencer and others, it was convenient to explain human behavior in terms of a set of instincts. In this early period of the development of psychology, the psychologists defined the concept of instincts differently and also enumerated different sets of instincts. The coup de grace in the instinct dispute came when Watson stated that there were no instincts in human behavior. The problem was not that easily settled but later a compromise was effected by devising the concept of instinctive reaction. This compromise was somewnat satisfactory but left the problem of the structure of an instinct unanswered. Logically, this concept of instinctive reaction is contrary to itself as what is derived by an instinct cannot be learned and what is learned cannot be derived from an instinct.

Because of these manifold problems created by the concept of instincts, the term maturation largely replaced the former concept. This term of maturation is not as specific as a well-defined instinct. Under this concept of maturation, nature provides the general pattern of growth within which the factor of learning can operate. In this way the diverse behavior of various cultures and even the varying behaviors among children of very similar genetic origin can be explained. The origin of behavior is describable as maturation as conditioned by learning. Maturation was characterized as being predictable, operating according to a rather definite time-schedule and that training cannot materially hasten the growth-process but gross adverse circumstances can delay it for a time.

One of the corollaries of maturation was the concept readiness. This concept of phylogenetic maturation supported the validity of the expression "Strike when the iron is hot". The experiments of Gesell were interpreted to support the dictum of taking advantage of phylogenetic readiness. Indeed the Gesell study applied to phylogenetic readiness as indicated by stair-climbing but applying the conclusion of Gesell to

ontogenetic development is only reasoning by doubtful analogy. Not too many years ago it was customary to administer to a child an intelligence test, frequently a group of intelligence tests, calculate the "sweep of mental growth curve", run a line from a certain age, such as 6.5 years (the age for being old enough to learn to read) to the point of intersection with the "mental growth curve" and then drop a line to the abscissa that determined the chronological age when a child would be "ready" to learn that skill. Parents were admonished by the "scientific" teachers not to "rush the child". If a child should learn to read before he had attained the age of readiness to learn to read, the child would be greatly handicapped in his later educational development. It was also assumed that if the child did not learn the reading skill at the time when the teacher thought that reading should be learned, the child could not learn it at a later age.

This immature viewpoint of human development was indeed syncretic and superficial. The concept of the I.Q. was so well-accepted that persons with low I.Q.'s were considered to be relegated by Nature to become "hewers of wood and drawers of water". Conversely, the children with high I.Q.s were thought to be the ones on whom "rested the hope of civilization". Also, it was tacitly assumed that what was latent in the person would eventually make itself evident, at least if there were not too many untoward circumstances. The accounts of impoverished persons who became famous lent support to a brand of social predestination. Also, the intellect of a person was overemphasized to the neglect of the person's emotions. Persons who had lost their motivation because of severe frustration were summarily classified as "no-goods" and quite beyond the pale of rehabilitation. It never dawned on these people that what a person feels and believes is the function of what he is and what he is is largely the result of what happened to him.

The importance of maturation in the learning of educational skills has recently declined to a considerable extent. It was pointed out years ago that the factors of maturation and learning are inextricably interwoven. For example, whenever the organism, including the fetus, makes any movement, originally induced by maturation, the opportunity for learning has already presented itself. As an illustration, the question arises whether the right-handedness of most persons is the result of maturation or is the result of an opportunity for freer movement on the dextral side of the fetus. Very likely both factors were operative. As a result of the emphasis on learning, the factor of maturation has been largely confined to explaining the development of the sensory-motor functions. In addition, the viewpoint of Bruner that any healthy child can learn any subject at any stage of development, provided he has had an educationally-honest training program, has at least challenged the mechanistic, deterministic and apparently unrealistic educational attitudes of the teachers.

On the other hand, the mechanism of the learning factor was decribable in terms of classical and instrumental conditioning. Since children cannot be reared in careful experimental conditions comparable to the exact laboratory conditioning of animal experimentation, ascribing the learning activities of children solely in terms of simple conditioning is somewhat unwarranted and unsupportable. Many problems need further investigation, such as why certain conditioned skills are more permanent than others, why certain conditioned skills transfer more readily than others and why certain skills learned with unpleasant emotions are later performed with pleasantness.

The answers to the problems posed above may be possibly answered by the phenomenon of imprinting. This phenomenon, emphasized by Lorenz, is characterized by early learning. The learning proceeds best when it is effortful to the organism. Such learning is remarkably permanent. Imprinting is conveniently illustrated by newly-hatched goslings following a moving toy up to the point of their exhaustion. Apparently the process of imprinting should occur before the emotion of fear has been developed. The skill learned by imprinting transfers to similar objects and it is easily remembered or re-learned. It was originally assumed that the process of imprinting applied only to the lower animals. This assumption, however, is untenable when mankind is considered to be a part of the general "animal kingdom".

The process of imprinting apparently has made extensive inroads in explaining behaviors that were previously considered to be instinctive. For example, the dog follows its master not because of the instinct of gregariousness but rather the following habit may be the result of imprinting. It is generally known that it is almost impossible to train pups reared in a wild state and convert them into "faithful followers" after they have arrived at the adult stage of development. Similar observations can be made about the domestic cat.

It is emphasized that the learning process describable by imprinting and by conditioning are not identical although there is considerable overlap between the two processes. Classical conditioning is essentially the substitution of a conditioned stimulus for some of the eliciting powers of the unconditioned stimulus. This substitution occurs when the responses to the conditioned stimulus or the "traces" of such responses and the responses to the unconditioned stimulus occur simultaneously in an interval of time. A good example of classical conditioning is the dog-bell experiment as originally carried out by Pavlov. Instrumental conditioning incorporates classical conditioning when the animal is conditioned to operate a gadget to obtain some sort of a need-reduction. The latter type of conditioning, however, differs from classical conditioning in that the organism is active instead of being passive as in Pavlovian conditioning. In other words, the organism does something to solve its problem, incurs a vast amount of trial and error activity and is finally induced to solve the problem by making a fortuitious movement. An example of instrumental conditioning is a cat seeking escape from a problem-box.

The conditioning procedure has several inherent limitations. The organism must be old or mature enough to be conditioned. It occurs with difficulty, if at all, when the organism is in its early stages of infancy. This condition is not in keeping with the imprinting procedures. Also, the activity of a gosling that follows a toy to the point of exhaustion is not comparable to instrumental conditioning. The gosling does not solve a problem. It just follows the toy. Another difference between instrumental conditioning and imprinting is found in the state of fatigue of the organism. Apparently the more effort the gosling puts forth, the better the imprinting. In the process of instrumental conditioning, however, the problem should not be too difficult nor demand too much effort on the part of the experimental animal. When the problem is too difficult, the animal remembers the "torture chamber" and this memory becomes an inhibition to good learning procedures.

One of the most crucial differences between conditioning and imprinting is the permanence of the latter. Although the responses learned by conditioning are not entirely lost by the inhibiting influences of counter-conditioning, such responses are so frequently in conflict with other responses that they do not become overt responses. In other words, the forgetting phenomenon occurs. With imprinting, however, the learned responses can withstand the inhibitions of conflicting responses and appear to be better learned, as judged by the readiness or availability of overt reaction. Sometimes such responses are contrary to "natural" ones. It has been reported that a wild duckling was befriended and nurtured by a house-wife. Later it was added to a flock of wild ducks. A year later the house-wife was greeted by a mature duck that violated its "natural urge" to fly with its fellows. Ostensibly this friendly wild duck was the befriended duckling of a previous year. Farm children can report similar experiences with pet lambs. Such animals will remain bleating in the fence-corners and refuse to join the flock of "normal" sheep.

By the application of the process of imprinting to human development, certain characteristics of development can become more understandable. For example, certain aspects of a cultural-pattern of a child are learned and detained with considerable tenacity although other aspects of that cultural-pattern are not retained. A child may have been imprinted with the habit of thrift in early childhood by requiring the child to exert effort in the saving-habit. On the other hand, the trait of neatness was not imprinted as the child did not exert effort in keeping its property in acceptable order. As a result the child did not inherit culturally the neat habits of its mother. A more interesting phenomenon occurs when a person remembers how he disliked the endless hours of piano-playing that he experienced in his childhood. Later when the child became an adult he is thankful that his parents imposed upon him these effortful activities in playing the piano. This phenomenon contradicts the frequently stated viewpoint that if children dislike practice, they should be excused from that activity. Similarly, it is said that if children like an activity, they will continue to prefer it even in their adulthood. A moment's reflection will reveal how youthful and pleasurable whims were summarily discarded in adulthood. It is very possible that the old school-master was not the educational sadist that some educational literature portrays him when he insisted on effortful activity on the part of the pupils in learning valuable skills, such as extracting the square root of a number. The old school-master was unknowingly attempting the process of imprinting.

In conclusion, the heredity-environment problem is apparently not entirely solved by suggesting that behavior is entirely a function of simple conditioning operating within a pattern of phylogenetic maturation. This problem is difficult to demonstrate among the human as our culture does not permit us to treat infants like expendable lower animals. In the face of the results of imprinting, we cannot be entirely certain of the validity of explaining behavior in terms of simple conditioning operating within a pattern of phylogenetic maturation.

Return of The North Sea Ghosts

By LESLIE ANDERS
Professor of History
Central Missouri State College

For nearly two decades the civilian and military leaders of the United States have kept an anxious watch on Soviet Russia. Apprehensively scanning the heavens above the northern hemisphere, we are acutely aware that somehow the world has divided into armed camps, one defending the idea of free institutions, the other dedicated to an authoritarian Marxist messianism. The military predominance of the American Republic is challenged by an aggressive, ill-mannered newcomer proclaiming itself the wave of the future. Our years go by, crisis following crisis, with cocked-gun diplomacy the rule. As our leaders sit on the edges of their chairs, fearing the worst but hoping for deliverance from tomorrow's catastrophe, the argument rages among our people over the rival claims of the "Warfare State" and the "Welfare State."*1 And the heat of controversy is only intensified by the widespread ignorance of the civilian public concerning the history and technology of warfare.*2

If it is any consolation to freedom's present-day defenders, let it here be said that all of this has happened before. In the generation leading up to the First World War the United Kingdom held the world leadership which has since passed to the United States. Like today's American leaders, the British chiefs then gazed nervously across freedom's ramparts in anticipation of a seemingly inevitable climactic struggle with authoritarian militarism. Soviet-Russian rocket-rattling diplomacy is a fitting successor to Kaiser Wilhelm II's diplomacy-by-bluster, and the commissar's "World Revolution" has succeeded the Kaiser's **Weltpolitik.** Communism's new industrialism has risen to challenge America's older industrialism, just as German industry once threw down the gauntlet to England's economic preponderance, late in the last century.

There are differences between now and then, of course. Germans are not Russians, a point that needs some emphasis. The arena of the challenge today is the stratosphere and outer space, whereas before 1914 it was the salt water of the North Sea, separating the British and German fleets. Unmanned missiles have succeeded the manned warships of 1914. The essential challenge now is a mixture of political and military aggression to create a global Russian empire, whereas in 1914 it was primarily the growing industrial and commercial power of Germany that seemed to threaten the economic and naval security of a Britain theretofore preponderant on the world stage. However all this may be, the fact remains that between 1898 and 1914 there existed between Britain and Germany a state of "cold war" full of parallels to (and therefore lessons for) the current era of tensions between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

After 1898 the British, as did their American cousins forty years later, reluctantly abandoned a traditional "splendid isolation" in favor of substantial diplomatic commitments to foreign powers. The Kaiser's unmannerly utterances and boundless ambitions for a "place in the sun" had already cast a pall on Anglo-German relations when, in 1898, the Germans announced a sudden new naval program, calling for a sustained effort to build 38 capital ships and 20 armored cruisers. Smoldering British resentment of German commercial successes now ripened into fears of a future German invasion, a sentiment aggravated by a rising virulent anti-Germanism in England. British diplomacy soon created a Triple Entente with France and Russia to "contain" Germany's Triple Alliance with Italy and Austria-Hungary.*3

Facing the German threat, the British showed the courage, ingenuity, and perseverance of their ancestors. Dominating the seas around Europe since the late sixteenth century, they had survived every peril created by scheming enemies or the implacable advances of technology. The Spaniards, the Dutch, and the French had been repulsed in their turns. The Royal Navy had faced the challenge of converting to steam, to iron hulls, to steel armor-plating, to torpedoes, and ever-greater ordnance. Each threat had raised the "good grey fleet" to new heights of superiority over vanquished or potential rivals. In all previous centuries the Briton had shaken off every appearance of decadence, and he was to display the same qualities in the years leading to 1914.

The German Challenge

Grand Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, German Navy Minister, had hardly started his imperial master's campaign to "seize the trident of Neptune" when a worthy opponent moved into the British Admiralty to take command of the fight to keep British supremacy on the North Sea. Admiral Sir John Arbuthnot Fisher, "relentless, remorseless, and ruthless," became First Sea Lord in 1902, bringing to the Admiralty a sense of urgency that it badly needed and would continue to have until the outbreak of war justified his expectations. The officers of the Royal Navy were put on notice that the enemies of Fisher's drive for security would have "widowed wives and fatherless children," that the "neutral" officers would see their careers blighted. If you did not support Fisher **"totus porcus,"** as he loved to say, you might as well oppose him equally "whole hog."

For seven frantic years the grim old sea dog hammered away at the tremendous job of turning back the German's challenge. He established nucleus crews for mothballed vessels, thereby gaining precious future mobilization-time. The submarine came into the British naval establishment, though scoffers secretly laughed for a while at "Fisher's toys." Sir John ruthlessly scrapped thousands of tons of obsolete shipping, battled Parliament year in and year out for bigger appropriations, and established the Home Fleet—a concentration of British naval power in the North Sea, headquartered at Scapa Flow, in the Orkneys.

In his ferocious effort to keep the Royal Navy supreme, Fisher came up with such a tremendous breakthrough in naval technology that even he was terrified at his success. In 1905 the **H. M. S. Dreadnought** was placed in commission, a splendid behemoth 490 feet long, weighing 17,000 tons and carrying ten 12-inch guns in her five turrets. The **Dreadnought** had cost 1,600,000 pounds (the value of Nelson's

entire fleet at Trafalgar!) and could make 21 knots. She was far superior to all those conventional "pre-Dreads", with their 5- and 6-inch popguns. Some older ships, it is true, had a few 12-inch guns aboard, but their mixture of large and small ordnance had caused great confusion in spotting salvoes at great ranges. The new battle wagon, having no smaller artillery, was the "all-big-gun" type and thus a far deadlier kind of ship than her predecessors. Britain, with her long headstart in pre-Dreads, now awakened to find the vast bulk of the Royal Navy obsolescent! Suppose Tirpitz now hurried up and launched a German Dreadnought—or two, or three? Technology had handed down the grim verdict that a new naval race must start, and Sir John bravely and unilaterally decreed that Britain would double Tirpitz's Dreadnought launchings "until charcoal sprouts."*4

Guns or Butter?

The new battleship was born under an unlucky political star. In the very year of her commissioning the Liberal Party swept into power on a platform promising expensive social-welfare programs to an England beginning to suffer the consequences of a fading industrial predominance. Guns or butter? With Tirpitz on one side of them and economic insecurity on the other, the voters meant to have both guns and butter. Let the politicians handle the details! Government circles shuddered, highly uncertain that the taxpayer could or would foot both bills. Hoping against hope that somehow the German government might let them off this hook, the Liberals decided to extend an olive branch to Berlin by unilaterally reducing Britain's naval program. Since the warlike Tories had started this Dreadnought race, and had laid down four Dreadnought keels in 1905, while the Germans laid only two, the Liberals announced that they would lay only three keels in 1906. With a cheeky brazenness worthy of a Khrushchev, Tirpitz greeted the Liberal gesture by raising his 1906 program to three! Thinking that Tirpitz had failed to get the message, London reduced the 1907 estimates to two—only to find Tirpitz raising his to four! When will appeasers ever learn?

The Liberal Cabinet had no choice but to go back to the naval race, and the game was played Fisher's way again, for a while.

During these years the British public and political leadership displayed a distressing tendency to over-dramatize the immediate significance of the Dreadnought. This had happened many times before in other cases. When Britain floated her first iron-clad in the middle of the nineteenth century, and it was learned in London that France was getting two, the halls of Parliament rang with laments over the end of Britain's naval supremacy! As if the great mass of wooden warships in Her Majesty's Navy had suddenly vanished! As if their shells had lost the power to kill! The British public in the last century, as well as the American public today, seemed prone to hail each military innovation as rendering worthless all existing hardware. But this is seldom the case in fact, and it was not so fifty years ago. Admiral Reinhard Scheer, who commanded the German High Sea Fleet at Jutland in 1916, later congratulated himself on a last-minute decision to take pre-Dreads into battle—after learning that the old "outmoded" vessels had actually saved his battle cruiser squadron from probable annihilation.*5

Yet, paradoxically, many of the same people in and out of government who howl calamity over technological achievements

abroad will resist the expense of keeping military inventories updated. As it is in McNamara's United States, so it was in Fisher's England, caught inexorably between the demands for guns or butter.*6

Technical Triumphs

Before he retired in 1909, Fisher did it again. In that year was launched the **Iron Duke,** a 25,000-ton vessel carrying ten 13½-inch guns in five turrets. Capable of landing seven tons of "pay-load" on targets 35,000 yards distant, the **Duke** had armament half again as potent as anything Tirpitz had yet displayed. So far as gun-power was concerned, Fisher was pulling away from Tirpitz in 1909 and 1910.

Fisher had also faced up to the issue of armor versus speed. You need both, he reasoned. But did every all-big-gun ship have to be weighted down with speed-sapping armor? In naval warfare there was more to do than just slug it out capital ship-to-capital ship. What about a ship capable of outshooting anything that could catch it and outrunning anything that could outshoot it? The answer was the battle cruiser, an all-big-gun vessel designed for pursuit and outflanking work, with the fire-power of a Dreadnought but with only a fraction of the armor. Fisher's new creation, of which the Home Fleet had nine when war came, could make 25 knots to the average battleship's 21.

Churchill's Innovations

Two years after Fisher's retirement as Britain's senior admiral, civilian leadership of the Navy passed to 37-year-old Winston S. Churchill. The new Liberal First Lord of the Admiralty, a "once and future Tory," destined for greatness as a war leader, laid ample foundations for his reputation as a creative military thinker within the three short years of peace remaining after 1911.

Three great decisions were before Churchill, each of which contained the possibility of decisive strategic advantages—or devastating damage to the nation's security. These were risks that demanded a Churchill, and the man and the hour met without ceremony and without trembling.

The 13½-inch gun had amply proved itself, but Churchill was anxious to "go one size better," an urge not unknown in the administration of present-day space-exploration projects. Why not a 15-inch gun for the capital ships now building? Fisher, asked for his opinion, declared that adoption of the new naval rifle would be the equivalent of a great naval victory and agreed with Churchill that failure to investigate its potentialities would constitute "treason to the Empire."

Problems arose, however. Bigger guns meant bigger ships, and this in turn meant hectoring a balky Parliament for increased naval appropriations. Moreover, the tense strategic situation on the North Sea made it necessary to avoid construction delays while redesigning vessels already in hand. A neat trick! Worse yet, no 15-inch gun had ever existed. Was it even feasible? Would it achieve the greater range and accuracy along with increased pay-load that the 13-incher had shown in comparison with the 12? Would the new gun create unforeseeable stresses that would fatally mar the five great ships then building?

Weighing the hazards, Churchill realized that it would take a year to prove out the new gun to the engineers' satisfaction, which meant that five capital ships would have to be commissioned "with an in-

ferior weapon to that which we had it in our power to give them," or else that they would go to sea with untried 15-inch rifles that might ruin them. Either way you sliced it, a year of precious "head start" might be forfeited. But, backed by the enthusiastic Fisher, Churchill boldly took the plunge. "Risks have to be run in peace as well as in war," he wrote to a colleague, "and courage in design now may win a battle later . . . ."*7

What a gamble it was for the youthful First Lord! All the guns were ordered after a hasty test-firing of a model rifle by the Ordnance Board and a private steel firm. It would be a year before the outcome of the gamble would be fully known. And if it failed? Churchill needed little imagination to picture an indignant House of Commons hounding him into political limbo as a brash and erratic lad who had substituted his immature judgment for that of older and wiser heads—and endangered his country in the bargain!

But it all came right in the end. The 15-inch rifle proved capable of landing a ton of explosive on targets 35,000 yards away. And with deadlier accuracy than attained in older models. "I felt as if I had been delivered from a great peril," Churchill later conceded.

This coup led the First Lord directly to another. Eight of these new guns could throw a salvo greater by a ton than **ten** of the 13½'s—and gave a disproportionately higher explosive effect, too. The gleam returned to Churchill's eye. Suppose, he asked, we put just eight of these mighty guns on a regular Dreadnought, keep those 13-inch armor-plated sides, and devote the old fifth turret's space to increased engine-power? The result might be a battleship with the speed of a battle cruiser, but with superior armor and **fire-power.** The Admiralty went right to work to build its "Fast Division," the 31,000-ton **Warspite, Barham, Malaya, Queen Elizabeth,** and **Valiant,** ships fast enough and dangerous enough to fight two World Wars.*8

But brilliant advances have a way of leading into knotty problems. It turned out that the super-dreads of the Fast Division could make 25 knots **only** by using petroleum fuel. Additionally, the Admiralty learned that oil would give the Navy 40 percent more radius per ton of fuel consumed than it could get using coal. Tankers could refuel the battle wagons at sea, whereas a fourth of a coal-burning fleet was always back in port taking on coal. Under wartime conditions, the coaling operation would rob the entire crew of its shore leave. It was also found that converting to oil would cut maintenance and operating personnel in half. Weighty reasons for converting!

But this had its repercussions. Fleets of tankers had to be built to bring in petroleum from abroad, since England had no oil resources of her own. Great storage facilities had to be built and protected. And a Navy dependent on foreign oil sources would necessarily press the government to take the lead in prospecting for oil and purchasing oil properties in such places as India, Persia, and the Arab Middle East. "This led to enormous expense and tremendous opposition on the Naval Estimates," Churchill admits. "Yet it was absolutely impossible to turn back."

The Nagging Fears

The military literature of that "age of anxiety" on the eve of 1914 dramatically captures for the reader the apprehensions daily haunting London. Would the Germans some day pull a cataclysmic surprise?

Churchill had no fear of their gunnery. The worst "nightmare novel" he had ever read had portrayed a German fleet unmasking 15-inch artillery to inflict a climactic defeat on the Royal Navy. But "this boot was on the other leg," Churchill could comfort himself. But what about torpedoes, increasingly sophisticated and now deliverable "with tenfold force" by submarines? Might not fiendish new types of mines erase Britain's margin of safety on the day of decision?

To keep the Navy alert, Churchill occasionally ordered up surprise "countdowns," asking the Naval Staff "What happens if war with Germany starts today?" Always on their toes, the admirals triumphantly demonstrated to their civilian boss how they could on short notice effect dispositions that would face the oncoming Germans with superior seapower. The Home Fleet carefully chose the time for its cruises to Spain and back—waiting until the German Navy "was having its winter refits." British North Sea maneuvers were conducted with careful regard for coaling and shore-leave arrangements which would not unduly embarrass the Home Fleet should the Germans "make their move."

Seeking Solutions

As in today's Cold War, statesmen in pre-1914 Britain were continually searching for a release of the unbearable tensions created by the strategic situation on the North Sea. After the Liberal regime's mawkish attempt to achieve disarmament-by-example collapsed in 1907, Fisher began campaigning for a "Pearl Harbor" attack on the Germans after the fashion of the Japanese thrust at Port Arthur in 1904—or Britain's own ravishment of Denmark's fleet in 1801.

Most British statesmen rivaled their American cousins in sentimentality, and they were also morally above Fisher's doctrine of the "pre-emptive strike," as we would call it today. The Committee of Imperial Defense secretly considered it very likely that Germany would, if decisive results were obtainable, try pre-emption against the Home Fleet, but the British official policy, as enunciated by Churchill at Glasgow in 1912, was that "We have no thoughts . . . of aggression, and we attribute no such thoughts to other Great Powers." The Foreign Office shortly afterward declared to the Germans that England would "make no unprovoked attack on Germany, pursue no aggressive policy towards her."

Such expressions awakened no corresponding sentiments in Berlin, but the British government decided in the winter of 1911-1912 to approach Germany with proposals for a "naval holiday." As is so often the case in politics, the Cabinet had twin motives. The more idealistic ministers primarily hoped for a relaxation of tensions on the North Sea diplomatic front, while the more hard-boiled members argued that the government's hand would be stronger in the annual battle for military appropriations if the House of Commons were convinced that an honest effort had been made to mitigate the ruinously expensive naval race.

The negotiations with Germany culminated in the visit of the Secretary of State for War, R. B. Haldane, to Berlin in early 1912. But the high British hopes for a naval settlement went to pieces in a hurry. The Kaiser gave Haldane a copy of proposed German naval construction for the years 1912-1916, which information revealed to the Admiralty a naval program destined to give Germany a 29-22 lead in capital ships unless a naval moratorium were achieved right away—or a drastic increase in British construction undertaken.

The German response to the British initiative was a masterpiece

of Khrushchevian impudence. A naval holiday, the German Foreign Office insisted, was unthinkable unless coupled with a general political settlement. Germany would be glad to scrap her projected increases in capital ships, provided Britain gave a contractual guarantee of her future neutrality in the event of a conflict among the continental Powers. Therefore, if Britain would junk the Triple Entente, the foundation-stones of her security, and return to "splendid isolation," Germany would be pleased to scrap some of those unbuilt warships! Heads, Germany wins. Tails, Britain loses. Britain's future security had to be left at the mercy of what Prince Bismarck had predicted would be "some fool thing in the Balkans."

Conclusions

There exists, then, a discernible similarity between the pre-1914 and the post-1945 eras. Whether the present era will end with a vast thermonuclear incineration of the human species is not within the competence of the historian to suggest. But while making all due allowances for large and small differences between the two eras compared above, it is clear that we can draw valuable lessons from the British experience of the earlier day. Each challenge posed by technical progress must be faced realistically, notwithstanding the tendency of military establishments to grow "conservative" toward familiar hardware. The value of vigorous and imaginative civilian and mlitary leadership cannot be overstressed. Vigilance is no infallible guarantee of victory, but the lack of it will certainly bring swift and bitter retribution. Purity of motive and sincerity of intent are by themselves of little value when dealing with opportunistic antagonists cynically determined to exploit every show of generosity toward them. Panic is not very helpful in such situations, either, for human opponents never turn out to be supermen.

Finally, there has never been a better time in the history of the world than now to promote the education of the sovereign citizenry in the history and terminology of the profession of arms. In recent decades it has become crystal-clear that warfare can no longer be the exclusive province of a closed society of professionals. Modern war has forced itself upon the people as a whole, obliterating once-meaningful distinctions between civilian and military spheres. The voracious requirements of past wars and fears of future wars consume today more than half our Federal Budget, a tenth of our Gross National Product. The American public owes its military professionals the sympathetic understanding that comes only from a deepening acquaintance with the past and present of warfare. Such understanding seems the best guarantee that our society will win the endurance contest thrust upon it within the past generation.

***Footnotes**

1. Fred Cook, "Juggernaut: The Warfare State," **The Nation**, Oct. 28, 1961 (special issue).
2. Tom Wintringham, **Weapons and Tactics** (London, 1943), pp. 16-17.
3. J. F. C. Fuller, **A Military History of the Western World** (New York, 1956), Vol. III, pp. 171-82.
4. Bernard Brodie, **Sea Power in the Machine Age** (Princeton, 1941), pp. 226-27.
5. Reinhard Scheer, **Germany's High Sea Fleet in the World War** (New York, 1934), p. 133.
6. Mark S. Watson, "Obsolescence," **Military Review**, June, 1961, 2-7.
7. Winston Churchill, **The World Crisis, 1911-1918** (London, 1932, one-vol. ed.) pp. 87-88.
8. Scheer, pp. 143, 146; Fuller, p. 481.

Private Foundations Have Aided Public Educational Innovation

By FRANKLIN PARKER
Professor of Education,
Unviersity of Oklahoma,
Norman, Oklahoma

* Reprinted from A Teachers College Journal, October, 1964.

GENERALLY, WE HAVE adapted well to the dynamics of culture change. A key ingredient in this adjusting process has been the innovative character of our public schools.

Beginning as educational borrowers, we are now an exporter of educational ideas. We borrowed the elementary school from Prussia; the dame school, academy, and college from England; the high school from Scotland; the kindergarten and graduate school from Germany. Some borrowings we have dropped, some we have transformed, and some units we have invented. We have coupled our school units into a ladder of opportunity for all.

In little more than a century of commitment to universal education, we have used our schools to adapt to changing times.

Our Schools Have Kept Us Free

Those who first came knew the Bible. Those who fought the Revolution knew John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau. Those who made the Constitution knew the Federalist Papers. Those who built canals and railroads knew transit and rule. Those who built industries knew mathematics and the lathe. Those who migrated to our shore found in public schools the cement of citizenship. Our schools have kept us informed. Our schools have kept us free.

Private Wealth for Public Good

But we have also had pockets of poverty and areas of neglect which private effort has sought to aid. For the untaught poor, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel started charity schools. For a public unable to tax itself further, private citizens started subscription school funds. From whatever source it sprang—Christian ethic or social conscience—a new corrective arose to meet the need: private wealth for public good.

Seeds of Educational Innovation

James Smithson, British chemist, left funds in 1826 for what later became the Smithsonian Institute. Charles Wilkes, in charge of naval charts and instruments and tired waiting for Congressional aid, began at his own expense in 1833 what later became the United States Naval Observatory. George Peabody, Massachusetts merchant and banker, by the time he died in 1869, had endowed three libraries and lecture halls, four public libraries, and three important museums of science. He endowed an academy, a college, and two historical societies. For the defeated Southern states he established the Peabody Education Fund.

The Peabody Education Fund was the first multimillion dollar foundation, first to be national in scope, first to select trustees from

professional and financial circles, first to promote private schools as models for national emulation, first to require matching state funds and permanent school legislation, first to promote education effectively through public relations, first to remove religious qualifications for grants, and first to set a time for expenditure of its principal.

Educational Renaissance in the South

George Peabody directly influenced John Hopkins to found the university and hospital which bear his name. He undoubtedly influenced Andrew Carnegie in his foundations. The Peabody Education Fund inspired four important Conferences on Education in the South. These led to the founding of the Southern Education Board. John D. Rockefeller drew trustees from both for his General Education Fund. Peabody trustees also served the John F. Slater Fund and the Anna T. Jeanes Fund, both seeking to improve Negro education. The Peabody Education Fund thus initiated an educational revival for both races in the South.

General Education Board

It was in the South that foundations first worked. To supplant ineffective academies, John D. Rockefeller's General Education Board subsidized visiting professors of secondary education to stimulate the founding of high schools. A dozen state legislatures passed enabling laws and by 1914 new high schools numbered 186 in Virginia, over 200 in Georgia, over 100 each in Arkansas and South Carolina, 74 in Tennessee, 60 in Alabama and so on through the South.

To combat the South's basic problem of poor agriculture, the Board found in Texas a transplanted Yankee teacher and agriculturalist, Dr. Seaman Knapp, who with foundation funds, initiated demonstration farming. Farmers believed what they themselves saw and tried. Crop yield increased. Cotton and corn clubs for youths, started by Knapp in 1908 and by 1913 enrolling 91,000, were the genesis of the 4-H Clubs. Knapp's work led to the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 and to state college agricultural extension services, a veritable rural education revolution led by one man with foundation backing.

Also influential were foundation-sponsored state school surveys which, in Maryland, Delaware, North Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, and Alabama, resulted in larger appropriations and deeper commitment to pubic education.

Two precedent-setting experimental schools were initiated by Rockefeller funds. His endowment of the University of Chicago made possible John Dewey's practice school at the turn of the century, and his General Education Board-sponsored experimental Lincoln School at Teachers College, Columbia University, enabled the Harold Rugg revisions of the social studies for junior and senior high schools.

Carnegie Corporation

Best known for his libraries, Andrew Carnegie's Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching pioneered in pensions for professors and teachers. This foundation practically remade medical education and also improved the professional preparation of dentists, engineers, foresters librarians, nurses and social workers. It improved accounting procedures and administrative practices in colleges and universities. It influenced national college entrance examinations, helped develop the Graduate Record Examination, and established the Educational Testing Service. It subsidized Gunnar Myrdal's **An American Dilemma**, a major study of the American Negro, and supported Janes B. Conant's series

on the high school, the junior high school, and teacher education. In international education, after World War II, it established at strategic universities area studies and research on Russia, Eastern Europe, the Near East, Asia, and Africa.

Ford Foundation

Giant among foundations, the Ford Foundation has spent $234.1 million on education in the United States. Its numerous educational innovations include advanced college placement for talented high school graduates, fifth year teacher education programs, programmed learning, team teaching, and educational television. Since 1960 it has acquainted the public with educational issues through the monthly "Education Supplement" in the prestigious **Saturday Review.** It has supported significant curriculum revision in the sciences and mathematics and continues to have large influence.

Conclusion

For man in his contemporary turmoil, longing for a past that seems in retrospect safe and secure, formal education appears slow to change. But change is inevitable and our generation faces a host of revolutions. With more to know and a shorter time to learn, our schools shoulder their heaviest tasks. Innovation in education is essential, not innovation for its own sake, but new approaches that produce better results. With little time and never enough public money, the real value of private aid for public education is clear—to spark new ideas and to pioneer new techniques. Such breakthroughs the foundations in their forward thrust are seeking to accomplish.

Charter Members Journal of Thought Fund

JAMES VAN PATTEN ..... Central Missouri State College
DONNA YOUNKER ..... Purdue University
WILLIAM FISHER ..... Texas Western College